**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING**
**Among**
**NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE SOUTHWEST REGION, U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION, U.S. FOREST SERVICE REGION 5, and**
**BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT NORTHERN CALIFORNIA DISTRICT**
**Regarding**
**IMPLEMENTATION OF STREAMLINED CONSULTATION PROCEDURES FOR SECTION 7 OF THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT**
***January 31, 2013***

This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is entered into by the National Marine Fisheries Service Southwest Region (NMFS), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Pacific Southwest Region (FWS), the U.S. Forest Service Region 5 (USFS), and the Bureau of Land Management Northern California District (BLM), collectively referred to herein as "the Participating Agencies" (also "Parties"). Collectively, FWS and NMFS are referred to herein as "the Services".

Purpose

The purpose of this MOU between the Participating Agencies is to reaffirm our commitment to and revise the process for streamlining consultation under section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. § 1531 et seq.), for actions within USFS Region 5 and BLM Northern California District lands in California. For FWS, this MOU would apply to lands in California within the jurisdictions of the Arcata, Klamath Falls, and Yreka Fish and Wildlife Offices. The interagency streamlined consultation procedures were originally signed by regional executives of the Participating Agencies in California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho on May 31, 1995. The process for streamlined consultation was also previously addressed in the *Streamlined Consultation Procedures for Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act - July 1999* (http://www.blm.gov/or/esa/procedure.htm). This MOU supersedes those previous agreements for the Participating Agencies in the area subject to this MOU. This MOU continues the intent, process, and direction of the initial streamlined consultation procedures. Reasons for the new MOU include clarification about team operations, roles and responsibilities, early coordination and to reaffirm the Parties' commitment to the streamlining process. The objective of the streamlined consultation process described herein is to reduce the likelihood of conflicts between listed species or critical habitat and proposed actions, and is similar to "early consultation" described at 50 C.F.R. § 402.11. Furthermore, the interagency coordination process described herein provides a mechanism for identifying and carrying out conservation[1] of threatened and endangered species under section 7(a)(1) of the ESA.

This MOU and implementation of the procedures are intended to:

- Further the conservation of ESA listed and proposed species.
- Facilitate coordination and collaboration among the Participating Agencies.
- Promote an efficient and effective ESA consultation process.

[1] The terms "conserve", "conserving", and "conservation" mean to use and the use of all methods and procedures which are necessary to bring any endangered species or threatened species to the point at which the measures provided pursuant to this Act are no longer necessary (16 U.S.C. § 1532(3)) .

- Establish and use interagency teams to ensure that adequate biological assessments (BAs) are prepared, to share information and discuss project effects with the goal of minimizing or avoiding adverse effects, and to facilitate the expedited issuance of biological opinions (BOs) or Letters of Concurrence (LOCs).

The interagency coordination and streamlining process described in this MOU consists of four major elements:

I. Streamlined Consultation Teams
II. Interagency Coordination
III. Streamlined Consultation
IV. Issue Elevation

## *I. Streamlined Consultation Teams*

**A. Interagency Level 3 Team (hereinafter Regional Executive Team).** A Regional Executive Team will be comprised of the USFS Regional Forester, BLM Northern California District Manager, NMFS Regional Administrator, and FWS Regional Director, or others as delegated. The Regional Executives have decision authority for issue resolution and policy guidance.

**B. Interagency Level 2 Team (hereinafter Level 2 Team).** Personnel currently assigned to Level 2 Teams are listed in Attachment A (field unit line officers or staff supervisors) and will be responsible for the following:

- Clarify time frames and priorities for consultation efforts;
- Monitor performance of Interagency Level 1 Teams (hereinafter "Level 1 Teams");
- Resolve disputed issues involving effects determinations, information needs for BAs and compliance with management plans and/or programmatic consultations;
- Elevate unresolved issues to the Regional Executive level; and,
- Contact the Regional Technical Team (RTT) for administrative or procedural assistance regarding implementation of the MOU, as necessary.

Subject to the limitations discussed in the section entitled "General Provisions", Level 2 Team members will ensure that the Level 1 Team members from their respective agencies have adequate resources and time to complete their duties (as described in this document).

**C. Level 1 Team.** Personnel currently assigned to Level 1 Teams are listed in Attachment A. Level 1 Teams are the core component of the streamlined consultation process. Level 1 Teams are comprised of biologists designated by their respective agencies as team members. Their role is to assist the participating land management agencies in designing programs and activities in such a way as to minimize or avoid adverse impacts to listed and proposed species, and designated critical habitat, and to further those species conservation in accordance with the ESA and its applicable implementing regulations. Level 1 Teams should endeavor to design programs and activities that further relevant recovery plans and are consistent

with recovery plan goals. General duties of Level 1 Teams include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Recommend a process to sort, batch, and prioritize actions;
- Outline conservation measures;
- Identify information needs for BAs;
- Recommend the scope/scale of BAs;
- Review adequacy of draft BAs and effects determinations;
- Develop the framework for consultations;
- Report consultation progress and serve as advisors to Level 2 Teams;
- Contact the RTT for administrative or procedural assistance regarding implementation of the MOU as necessary; and
- Elevate issues as necessary.

**D. Regional Technical Team (RTT).** The RTT is composed of the regional technical specialists identified in Attachment B. The RTT's goals are:

- To ensure that procedures described in this MOU are implemented consistently;
- To facilitate communication about the procedural implementation of this MOU; and,
- To ensure that the MOU is up to date, in accordance with the section titled *General Provisions*.

The RTT provides advice on the procedural implementation of this MOU to facilitate efficiency, and assists in the maintenance of this MOU by performing the following tasks:

- Discussing and identifying potential improvements and revisions to the streamlining process for the consideration of the Regional Executive Team members;
- Updating the MOU as specified in the section titled *General Provisions*;
- Providing advice to the Level 1 and Level 2 teams regarding the procedural implementation of the MOU upon the team's joint request, or at the joint request of the Regional Executive Team;
- Providing advice to the Level 1 and Level 2 teams regarding the development of the team's Local Operating Guide, upon the team's joint request or at the joint request of the Regional Executive Team; and,
- Communicating with new Level 2 Team members regarding their roles and responsibilities.

Any advice from the RTT as a whole shall only be provided by the consensus of all RTT members. Any disagreements between the RTT members may be elevated to Level 3 upon the request of one of the RTT members. The outcome of this elevation will be documented in a letter to the Level 2 Team.

## *II. Interagency Coordination*

The Participating Agencies understand the importance of the Service(s) participation in the early stages of project planning and development: early coordination is key to the mutual success of the streamlining process. The success of early involvement depends on the following:

- Timely communication of the action agency's annual work load plan to allow the Service(s) to manage their involvement; and,
- Coordination among the action agency Level 1 Team representative and the action agency interdisciplinary team during project development.

Early involvement in project planning is intended to address concerns regarding listed and proposed species and their habitat (including designated critical habitat) and to increase the integration of habitat enhancement actions that further the recovery of listed species into land management activities. Effects minimization measures are to be incorporated into project designs, as necessary, to reduce or avoid effects to species and their habitat. Enhancement measures, as informed by relevant information, such as recovery plans and watershed analyses, are to be included in project designs, as appropriate, to enhance conservation of listed species. Participating Agency biologists will help to identify appropriate measures as described in the *Endangered Species Consultation Handbook, Procedures for Conducting Section 7 Consultations and Conferences* (USFWS-NMFS 1998).

Specific steps to be taken to ensure early coordination include the following:

**A. Local Operating Guide for Implementing Streamlined Consultation**. Each Level 1 and 2 Team may develop an Operating Guide for their respective management unit to provide additional information to the Level 1 and 2 team members about the implementation of this MOU in their respective management unit. Information provided therein may include the identification of meeting schedules and the process for obtaining input from senior staff prior to elevation. Level 1 and 2 teams may annually update or append their Operating Guide, as necessary.

**B. Annual Workload Planning**:

1) At least once each year the action agency will develop a list of proposed actions (implementation and planning) for their respective management units (e.g., Forest or District) planned for the current fiscal year and beyond (e.g. "out-year planning"), as available, that may affect listed or proposed species or their habitats. Each proposed action should include the location (including map(s) of individual or multiple projects), a brief summary (including ESA listed or proposed species within the project area), and the anticipated milestones (dates).
2) Action agency Level 1 Team representatives will provide the list of proposed actions to their corresponding NMFS and FWS counterparts.
3) Level 1 Teams will develop a meeting schedule and agendas to accomplish the workload identified by the Level 2 Team.
4) Level 2 Teams are encouraged to convene an annual interagency coordination meeting at the Forest and BLM field office level to discuss resources, issues and opportunities.

**C. Annual Interagency Regional Coordination Meeting**:

1) The Participating Agencies will convene an annual coordination meeting among the Regional Executive Team (or their designated representatives) and the Level 2 Team. Additional participants may include other representatives from Participating Agencies, as necessary. The annual coordination meeting will be scheduled by the Regional Executive Team to occur within the first quarter of the fiscal year (immediately following execution of the MOU) and will cover the following topics (including, but not limited to):
    - Streamlining process and progress report (presented by Level 2 Teams);
    - Issue elevations;
    - Regional guidance on workload planning and prioritization;
    - Regional conservation opportunities;
    - Resource sharing needs and opportunities (financial and human resources);
    - Upcoming challenges (workload, budget, legal); and
    - Interagency coordination evaluation and recommendations for improvements.

## *III. Streamlined Consultation Process*

After a proposed action is identified, the action agency will present project information to the Level I Team for review of project designs, minimization measures, conservation measures, preliminary effects determinations, current status of the species, and draft BAs. Specific steps to be taken are as follows:

**A. Establish Schedule for Level 1 Team Meetings**. Level 1 Teams will meet, as necessary, according to an annual coordination and consultation strategy and schedule. The action agency Level 1 Team member will notify project leaders of these meeting dates, and reiterate the importance of early coordination with the Service(s) during project development.

**B. Action Agency Submits Project Information Forms**. The action agency Level 1 Team member will work with their respective project leaders to complete and submit (to the Service(s) Level 1 Team member) a *Project Information Form* (PIF; format to be developed by each Level 1 Team) two weeks prior to the scheduled meeting on the subject proposed action(s). The PIF summarizes ESA considerations of the proposed action. All parties should be familiar with the project, since discussions between the action agency project leader, biologists and the Services are expected to have occurred during the early planning phase.

**C. Level 1 Team Work and Preliminary Effects Determination**. The Level 1 Teams are intended to abide by the streamlining process and communicate with each other as often and as early as feasible. Any joint findings regarding content of the BA must be by consensus between the agencies. Each Level 1

Team may develop its own Operating Guide in order to provide additional information to its team members regarding the implementation of this MOU in their respective management unit. Any operating guide must be consistent with this MOU. The approval or revision of any team's operating guide will require consensus of the participating agencies constituting the Level 1 and 2 teams.

Each action agency project leader and other resource specialists, as appropriate, will present a detailed description of the proposed project(s) to the Level 1 Team during the Interagency Level 1 Team meetings. Additional staff from the action agency or the Service(s) should be invited to attend a Level 1 Team meeting when additional expertise is warranted. Expected outcomes of initial Level 1 Team meetings include developing a common understanding of the project, identifying information gaps for ESA-related analyses, setting up a site visit as necessary, and establishing future meetings. Subsequent Level 1 Team meetings are held to discuss and incorporate measures that minimize effects of the project on listed species, to agree on the contents of the draft BA, and to discuss preliminary effect determinations[2] and preliminary terms and conditions of a BO if the project is likely to result in incidental take.

Disagreements should be elevated using the procedures described below. All potentially contentious issues are expected to be discussed at this level and most or all issues should be resolved before elevation is necessary. If a joint finding cannot be made due to lack of consensus, such issues will be elevated.

Using the best scientific and commercial data available, the Services will independently make any final determinations within their respective authorities, including final determinations concerning the content and findings in Service-authored biological opinions and letters of concurrence. Among other considerations, the ability to provide any preliminary agreement will depend on the complexity of the action and the level of information presented to the Level 1 Team.

**D. Draft BA Development and Review**. On the basis of early planning and Level 1 Team meeting(s), action agencies will prepare a draft BA in a time frame that is reasonable relative to the complexity of the project. At this point, the action agency will have identified its proposed action and the Level 1 Team can assume that the proposed action will not change in a way that materially changes the analysis in the draft BA. The Action agency will submit the draft BA to the Services for review and comment. The Service(s)

---

[2] While the Services can provide technical assistance, they will not provide concurrence with action agency "no effect" determinations. Any discussion of action agency "no effect" determinations by the Services' Level 1, 2, or 3 team members is provided as technical assistance and does not signify the Services' express or implied concurrence.

review and comment period will also be within a time frame that is reasonable relative to the complexity of the project, however, the Service(s) will strive for a two-week review and comment period. When the Service's comments are received, Level 1 Team members may meet if necessary to discuss incorporation of the comments into the final BA, clarify comments, or resolve issues related to the comments. The final BA must be agreed-upon by the Level 1 Team prior to the action agency requesting consultation. Agreement will be documented in Level 1 Team meeting notes, or email correspondence between Level 1 Team members (prior to submission of the BA), and in the final BA[3].

Action agency project leaders must ensure that a project brought forward for consultation complies with existing management plans. Compliance with USFS Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMPs) and BLM Resource Management Plans (RMPs) can be addressed in the BA by referencing the NEPA compliance review form completed for each project.

E. **Final BA and Consultation Initiation**. When the action agency submits the final BA (as finalized by the Level 1 Team), the action agency's cover letter requesting consultation should reference the Level 1 Team review and conclusions. Consultation will be initiated when an agreed-upon BA and request for consultation is received by the Service(s).

F. **Consultation Time Frame and Preparation of Biological Opinions**. Upon receipt of the written request for consultation and the final BA, the Service(s) will, based on the best scientific and commercial data available, prepare a Letter of Concurrence within 30 days (informal consultation) or a BO within 60 days (formal consultation), depending on the outcome of the Service's respective factual determination.

When requested, the Service(s) will provide a draft BO to the action agency for consideration prior to issuing the final BO. This may delay the 60-day time frame for the final BO.

The Service(s) will coordinate with the action agency during development of Reasonable and Prudent Measures/Terms and Conditions necessary or appropriate to minimize the impact of incidental take (i.e., amount or extent of take) and to determine the monitoring required. The BO may result in project modifications if any of the following circumstances occur:

---

[3] As stated elsewhere in this MOU, the Services do not provide concurrence with action agency "no effect" determinations and will use the best scientific and commercial data available to make any final determinations within its authority independently. Any agreement on a final BA does not signify the Services' concurrence on any "no effect" determination or restrict its ability to make independent, final determinations in its Letters of Concurrence and Biological Opinions based on the best scientific and commercial data available.

- the Service(s) determine the project is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a species or destroy or adversely modify critical habitat and the project is modified according to the Reasonable and Prudent Alternative(s),
- there are mandatory terms and conditions necessary to minimize incidental take, or
- the action agency adopts conservation recommendations offered by the Service(s).

An extension of the 30 and 60-day time frames may be agreed to by the Level 2 Team. Any additional time (beyond 60 days) to review and, if necessary in the Service's opinion, to revise the BO will be determined through mutual agreement between the Level 2 Team based on project and consultation complexity. The 30 and 60-day time frames apply to individual project consultations, batched consultations, reinitiations (including reinitiations based on new listed species or designations of critical habitat), and programmatic consultations with a determination of "not likely to adversely affect." The 60-day time frame would not apply to programmatic consultations with "likely to adversely affect" determinations.

## *IV. Issue Elevation*

Level 1 team members may be unable to reach agreement on certain aspects of the consultation. Additionally, disagreement may occur between the Level 1 team members and the action agency project leader over some aspect of the project. The Level 1 Team may require clarification on policy or direction. When there is no progress to resolve differences or clarification is needed, the Level 1 Team will submit a written request for assistance to the Level 2 Team. The ultimate resolution of the issue, or direction, will be documented in a letter from the Level 2 Team to the Level 1 Team; any direction or ultimate resolution provided to the Level 1 Team by the Level 2 Team will be decided upon by consensus. If consensus cannot be reached, the issue will then be elevated to the Regional Executives. Elevations are not a failure, but are an important signal that the streamlining process is working to resolve difficult issues. It is important to make use of the informal process to the extent practical before formally elevating issues. The streamlining process relies on Level 1 Teams to informally interact and have dialogue with Level 2 Teams and to rely on these various entities for expertise, guidance, and advice.

## General Provisions

The above process may require modifications or fine-tuning during implementation. Therefore, the Participating Agencies agree to evaluate the effectiveness of this MOU on an annual basis and amend or modify it as necessary to improve the process; any amendment or modification will require the consent of all Parties to this MOU. Any Party may terminate their participation in this MOU within 30 days of written notification to the other Parties. Although the intent of the MOU is to streamline the consultation process, statutory requirements and the regulations of each Participating Agency remain in effect. The Parties of the agreement agree to utilize the timelines provided in this document; however, where any other regulatory requirements or any statutory requirements are inconsistent with the terms of the MOU, the regulatory or statutory requirements will prevail. This MOU does not commit the Participating Agencies to activities beyond the scope of their respective missions, funding and authorities. Any federal funding, including personnel time, needed to carry out any federal agency responsibilities under this MOU shall be subject to the availability of appropriated funds pursuant to the Anti-Deficiency Act (31 U.S.C. § 1341). There will be no exchange of funds between Parties unless otherwise agreed. The ability of the Parties to carry out their responsibilities under this agreement is subject to their respective funding procedures and, as stated above, the availability of appropriated funds. Should one of the Parties encounter budgetary problems in the course of its respective internal procedures which may affect the activities to be carried out under this agreement, that Party will notify and consult with the other Parties in a timely manner. The nominated contact person for each of the Participating Agencies is identified in Attachment B. Changes related to a Participating Agency's contact person may be made by written notification to each of the Participating Agencies. This MOU shall be effective upon the signature of all Participating Agencies.

Signatures and dates

Rodney R. McInnis
Regional Administrator
NMFS Southwest Region

Ren Lohoefener
Regional Director
USFWS Pacific Southwest Region

Randy Moore
Regional Forester
USFS Pacific Southwest Region

Nancy Haug
District Manager
BLM Northern California District Office

**Attachment A: Streamlining Process Team Members**

**Attachment A Table 1. Streamlining Process Team Members: National Marine Fisheries Service and US Forest Service.**

| National Marine Fisheries Service Area Offices | National Marine Fisheries Service Streamlining Teams | US Forest Service Streamlining Teams |
|---|---|---|
| NMFS Northern California Office<br>1655 Heindon Road<br>Arcata, CA 95221 | *Level 3: Chris Yates*<br>*Level 2: Irma Lagomarsino*<br>*Level 1:*<br>*Six Rivers NF:* Leslie Wolff<br>*Klamath NF:* Don Flickinger<br>*Shasta-Trinity NF:* Katie McGourty | *Level 3: Randy Moore*<br>*Six Rivers NF*: Level 2 Tyrone Kelley; Level 1 Karen Kenfield<br>*Klamath NF*: Level 2 Patricia Grantham; Level 1 Brian Thomas<br>*Shasta-Trinity NF*: Level 2 Sharon Heywood; Level 1.5 Bill Brock; Level 1 Samantha Chilcote |
| NMFS North Central Coast Office<br>777 Sonoma Avenue<br>Santa Rosa, CA 95404 | *Level 3: Chris Yates*<br>*Level 2: Dick Butler*<br>*Level 1:*<br>*Los Padres NF*: Jonathon Ambrose<br>*Mendocino NF*: Tom Daugherty | *Level 3: Randy Moore*<br>*Los Padres NF*: Level 2 Peggy Hernandez; Level 1 Kevin Cooper<br>*Mendocino NF:* Level 2 Tom Contreras; Level 1 Lee Morgan |
| NMFS Central Valley Office<br>650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100<br>Sacramento CA, 95814 | *Level 3: Chris Yates*<br>*Level 2: Maria Rea*<br>*Level 1:*<br>*Mendocino NF:* Gretchen Umlauf<br>*Shasta-Trinity NF (Sacramento River only):* Gretchen Umlauf<br>*Lassen NF:* Gretchen Umlauf | *Level 3: Randy Moore*<br>*Mendocino NF:* Level 2 Tom Contreras; Level 1 Lee Morgan<br>*Shasta-Trinity NF:* Level 2 Sharon Heywood; Level 1.5 Bill Brock; Level 1 Samantha Chilcote<br>*Lassen NF:* Level 2 Jerry Bird; Level 1 Melanie McFarland |
| Southern California Office<br>501 West Ocean Boulevard,<br>Suite 4200 Long Beach, CA<br>90802-4213 | *Level 3: Chris Yates*<br>*Level 2: Penny Ruvelas*<br>*Level 1:*<br>*Los Padres NF*: Brittany Struck<br>*Cleveland NF*: Brittany Struck | *Level 3: Randy Moore*<br>*Los Padres NF*: Level 2 Peggy Hernandez; Level 1 Kevin Cooper<br>*Cleveland NF*: Level 2 Will Metz; Level 1 Kirsten Winter |

**Attachment A Table 2. Streamlining Process Team Members: US Fish and Wildlife Service and US Forest Service.**

| US Fish and Wildlife Service Field Office | US Fish and Wildlife Service Streamlining Teams | US Forest Service Streamlining Teams |
|---|---|---|
| Yreka Fish and Wildlife Office<br>1829 South Oregon Street<br>Yreka, CA 96097 | *Level 3: Mike Fris*<br>*Level 2: Erin Williams*<br>*Level 1: Laura Finley and Jan Johnson* | *Level 3: Randy Moore*<br>*Klamath NF*: Level 2 Chris Frisbee; Level 1 Sue Stresser and Christy Cheyne<br>*Shasta-Trinity NF*: Level 2 Sharon Heywood; Level 1 Kelly Wolcott |
| Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office<br>1655 Heindon Road<br>Arcata, CA 95221 | *Level 3: Mike Fris*<br>*Level 2: Nancy Finley*<br>*Level 1: Lisa Schmoele, John Hunter and James Bond* | *Level 3: Randy Moore*<br>*Six Rivers NF*: Level 2 Tyrone Kelley; Level 1 Brenda Devlin<br>*Mendocino NF*: Level 2 Sherry Tune; Level 1 Jim Ruhl |
| Klamath Falls Fish and Wildlife Office<br>1936 California Avenue<br>Klamath Falls, OR 97601 | *Level 3: Mike Fris*<br>*Level 2: Laurie Sada*<br>*Level 1: Elizabeth Willy, Nolan Banish, and Tia Adams* | *Level 3: Randy Moore*<br>*Modoc NF:* Level 2 Kimberly Anderson; Level 1 Alyssa Fellow, TBD Doublehead District Wildlife Biologist, Forest Gauna, and Marty Yamagiwa |

**Attachment A Table 3. Streamlining Process Team Members: National Marine Fisheries Service and Bureau of Land Management.**

| National Marine Fisheries Service Area Offices | National Marine Fisheries Service Streamlining Teams | Bureau of Land Management Streamlining Teams |
|---|---|---|
| NMFS Northern California Office<br>1655 Heindon Road<br>Arcata, CA 95221 | *Level 3: Chris Yates*<br>*Level 2: Irma Lagomarsino*<br>*Level 1:* Zane Ruddy | *Level 3: Nancy Haug*<br>*Arcata FO*: Level 2 Lynda Roush; Level 1 Dave Fuller or AJ Donnell<br>*Redding FO*: Level 2 Jennifer Mata; Level 1 Gary Diridoni |
| NMFS North Central Coast Office<br>777 Sonoma Avenue<br>Santa Rosa, CA 95404 | *Level 3: Chris Yates*<br>*Level 2: Dick Butler*<br>*Level 1:*Tom Daugherty | *Level 3: Nancy Haug*<br>*Arcata FO*: Level 2 Lynda Roush; Level 1 Dave Fuller or AJ Donnell |
| NMFS Central Valley Office<br>650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100<br>Sacramento, CA 95814 | *Level 3: Chris Yates*<br>*Level 2: Maria Rea*<br>*Level 1: Gretchen Umlauf* | *Level 3: Nancy Haug*<br>*Redding FO*: Level 2 Jennifer Mata; Level 1 Gary Diridoni |

**Attachment A Table 4. Streamlining Process Team Members: US Fish and Wildlife Service and Bureau of Land Management.**

| USFWS Field Office | USFWS Streamlining Teams | BLM Streamlining Teams |
|---|---|---|
| Yreka Fish and Wildlife Office<br>1829 South Oregon Street<br>Yreka, CA 96097 | *Level 3: Mike Fris*<br>*Level 2: Erin Williams*<br>*Level 1: Laura Finley; Jan Johnson* | *Level 3: Nancy Haug*<br>*Arcata FO*: Level 2 Lynda Roush; Level 1 Dave Fuller or AJ Donnell<br>*Redding FO*: Level 2 Jennifer Mata; Level 1 Gary Diridoni |
| Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office<br>1655 Heindon Road<br>Arcata, CA 95221 | *Level 3: Mike Fris*<br>*Level 2: Nancy Finley*<br>*Level 1: Liisa Schmoele, John Hunter and James Bond* | *Level 3: Nancy Haug*<br>*Arcata FO*: Level 2 Lynda Roush; Level 1 Dave Fuller or AJ Donnell<br>*Redding FO*: Level 2 Jennifer Mata; Level 1 Gary Diridoni |
| Klamath Falls Fish and Wildlife Office<br>1936 California Avenue<br>Klamath Falls, OR 97601 | *Level 3: Mike Fris*<br>*Level 2: Laurie Sada*<br>*Level 1: Elizabeth Willy, Nolan Banish, and Tia Adams* | *Level 3: Nancy Haug*<br>*Alturas FO*: Level 2 Tim Burke; Level 1 Arlene Kosic |

**Attachment B: Streamlining MOU Regional Technical Team**

**Attachment B Table 1. Streamlining Process Regional Technical Team: NMFS, US Fish and Wildlife Service, US Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management.**

| Agency | Streamlining MOU<br>Regional Technical Team Member |
|---|---|
| National Marine Fisheries Service<br>Southwest Region | Alice Berg<br>Endangered Species Act Specialist<br>NOAA Fisheries<br>U.S. Department of Commerce<br>Southwest Region<br>650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br>alice.berg@noaa.gov<br>(916) 930-3727<br><br>Rosalie B. del Rosario, Ph.D.<br>Regional Endangered Species Act Advisor<br>National Marine Fisheries Service<br>501 West Ocean Blvd., Suite 4200<br>Long Beach, CA 90802<br>*rosalie.delRosario@noaa.gov*<br>(562) 980-4085 |
| US Forest Service<br>Region 5 | Michael S. Kellett<br>Regional Fisheries Biologist<br>USDA-Forest Service, Region 5<br>1323 Club Drive<br>Vallejo, CA 94592<br>*mkellett02@fs.fed.us*<br>(707) 562-8940 |
| US Fish and Wildlife Service<br>Pacific Southwest Region | Jana Affonso<br>Deputy Division Chief<br>Section 7, Section 10, and Habitat Conservation<br>U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service<br>Region 8 Ecological Services<br>2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2606<br>Sacramento, CA 95825-1846<br>*Jana_Affonso@fws.gov*<br>(916) 414-6593 |
| Bureau of Land Management<br>California State Office | Amy L. Fesnock<br>CA BLM Wildlife and T&E Lead<br>2800 Cottage Way, W-1928<br>Sacramento, CA 95825<br>*afesnock@blm.gov*<br>(916) 978-4646 |